TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Friday, August 5, 2011
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Conference Room 230

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT
Steve Ballance	Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
Ron Bitterli	Jeremiah Matthews
Karl Heckart, Chair	Alan Turner
Jennifer Gilbertson	
Randy Kennedy	
Cary Meister	
Jared Nishimoto	
Eloise Price	
Rick Rager	
Kyle Rimel	

GUESTS	AOC STAFF
John Barrett, *Maricopa Superior Court*	Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Charles Drake, *PCCJC*	Amy Somma, *ITD*
Nick Felber*, *Yuma Superior Court*	Ridge Franks, *ITD*
Jim Putz-Artrup, *La Paz Superior Court*	Nat Mara, *ITD*
Teri Softley*, *Apache Clerk's Office*	Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Kevin Westover, *Maricopa Superior Court*	Robert Roll*, *ITD*
	Steven Scales, *ITD*
	Jethro Sheridan, *ITD*
	Cynthia Thomas, *ITD*

* indicates appeared via telephone

TAC MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OPENING REMARKS	Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), called the meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. and conducted a roll call of those on the phone and those present in the room to begin the new fiscal year. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

Karl requested discussion or a motion regarding the minutes of the April 1st TAC meeting.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the April 1, 2011, TAC meeting. The motion passed unanimously.	

UPDATE	KEY PROJECT UPDATES	Karl Heckart

Karl briefed members on some organizational changes at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the progress of certain state-level initiatives, including:

- Software development/release management – Cynthia Thomas is now the sole individual in charge of software development including vendor activities.
- County CIO meetings – Another round is being scheduled and the theme is likely to be coordination among justice partners as integration demands increase.
- Project load – Commisison on Technology (COT) members were made aware of the issues with local and statewide project loads at the annual meeting in May. Karl handed out the general tiers of project priorities that were approved and described how local resources could use the tiers to make priority decisions.
- AZTurboCourt – Maricopa civil subsequent filings will ratchet up noticeably after September 1. PayPal is a known issue for businesses, so investigation continues of a credit card centric payment alternative. Enhancements being delivered by the vendor August 12 will aid appellate courts, as well as the Pima civil filing soft launch scheduled for September 19. Pima's specifications have been sent to the vendor for inclusion in the AJACS e-filing release supporting statewide e-filing. Maricopa Justice Courts have identified some "showstoppers" that will ultimately delay their implementation date for small claims e-filings.
- General Jurisdiction (GJ) AJACS – Release 3.6 is currently being rolled out to remaining GJ courts throughout August. Karl previewed numerous functions planned to arrive in upcoming releases through 3.10. 4.0 is shaping up to be a major product release from AmCad.
- Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) AJACS – The AZTEC replacement effort looks like it will run from 2013 through 2017. LJ data conversion remains a hot issue. Analysis continues, but Karl informed local courts that they are free to convert all of their own data if they feel the AOC's approach is unacceptable for their needs.
- JOLTSaz – The Pima go-live date has been rescheduled to February 21, 2012. Testing is underway with the thin client architecture used there. Enhanced integration specifications required for rollout to the rural courts are being delivered to AmCad for inclusion in the AJACS 3.8 release.
- APETS – The application is being ported from Informix to SQL in early 2012, then the focus will change to integration with AJACS.

- e-Citation – Discussions are underway with Pragmatica about providing e-citation support though JWI since DPS continues giving out TRaCS to local law enforcement with no central support mechanism.
- Statewide warrant processing – The consultant's recommendation coming in September will include legislative changes required to revise the overall business process, Karl has recommended that ACJC conduct a greenfield study of warrant processing apart from any current business process or ownership.
- Probate automation – Rules won't be finalized until October, but the automation task doesn't appear to be simple due to requirements for capturing many data items and feeding an alerting mechanism that calls judicial attention to cases that trip certain thresholds.
- Criminal e-filing – The vendor is rethinking the approach after seeing the detailed requirements generated. ADRS already provides detailed criminal data, so integration rather than replication makes the most sense.

DEMON-STRATION	ROAM PROBATION/SHERIFF'S FUNCTIONALITY	Dan Corsetti Robert Roll

Robert Roll, from the AOC integration group, briefly refreshed members on the way ROAM grabs data from multiple sources and indexes it in a way that makes extremely rapid searching possible. He demonstrated a couple of test indexes and details available to be drilled into. He also demonstrated how multiple indexes can appear on the same screen. Robert confirmed that different indexes can be used to show only certain data to various roles of searchers and that the frequency of refreshing the indexes can be easily configured. Karl pointed out that ROAM indexes will allow non-court justice partners access to data without being AJACS users. Members warned that clerks will need a very long test cycle before any financial data is added to indexes.

REVIEW / APPROVE	e-CITATION SPECIFICATION CHANGES FOR TRACS	Ridge Franks

Ridge Franks, AOC's project manager for electronic citation implementation, provided statistics on DPS's statewide deployment of the citation module of their Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS) and their rollout strategy. He provided the background for the specification changes required to support TraCS and clarified that non-TraCS users continue to be supported under the current specification. Ridge would like to transition everyone to the new specification over time, though. He requested that members approve the addition of TraCS-related tags to the specification, as Version 1.2, so that it can be posted for law enforcement and vendor use.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to adopt the changes to the e-citation XML specification, as proposed, making Version 1.2. The motion passed unanimously.**	

REVIEW/ DISCUSS	AJACS PHOTO ENFOREMENT CASE PROCESSING	Cynthia Thomas

Cynthia Thomas, newly named manager of software development at the AOC, described changes in business process associated with citation processing in AJACS version 3.6 and later. There are various items requested by different vendors that are configuration elements courts may choose to turn on or leave off. In general, the court will set the arraignment date and provide notice to the vendor. The capability also exists to reverse an acknowledgement if sent in error.

Amy Somma, the business analyst on the effort, answered questions from members about the 90 day requirement and added that a focus group representing seven courts formed the genesis of the effort to reduce user involvement in e-citations to an absolute minimum. Randy Kennedy pointed out that not every member agreed with every business requirement Amy had put forward.

REVIEW / DISCUSS	CREATING SHAREABLE SSRS REPORTS FOR AJACS	Cynthia Thomas

Cynthia Thomas shared Ken Kung's five-stage plan (since Ken was not available for the meeting) for constructing a set of standardized, sharable, ad hoc reports in SSRS to benefit AJACS users across the state The plan involves better defining the structure for sharing as well as using Ken as the moderator to perform the necessary documentation step and generalizing the parameters for other counties to use. Cyndi asked that those having reports to share begin the process by contacting Ken. She added that Crystal reports are fair game at this stage, but that emphasis will be on converting them to SSRS before sharing takes place. She also answered members' questions about the way views would be preserved in subsequent AJACS releases.

UPDATE	CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY	Stewart Bruner

Stewart Bruner, Manager of Strategic Planning at the AOC ITD, described the OnBase environment now in place to support public access and electronic filing. The document transfer system has been engineered to take all case-related documents from each business day. He asked that clerks or judges using standalone systems communicate their expectation of the type, estimated number, and retention period of documents beyond the case-event-related records they desire to replicate to the central document repository. This will serve as input into the AOC's plan for bringing backdated documents into the CDR. Karl added that doing so frees the court to meet the requirements of ACJA 1-507 and destroy the paper from which the electronic version has been made. He also clarified that the CDR is a replication of documents stored on a local court system authorized by a subscription – AOC makes no decision about what to show and does not automatically send e-filed documents received by TurboCourt to the CDR.

Stewart also explained that Document Transfer Module installation was moved out of the scope of the OnBase 9.2 upgrade by OSAM, so it will result in a further charge to the court unless they want help from Jethro Sheridan, AOC's certified installer. Since the license is already in place for each court, he estimates a couple of hours of labor to do the installation, configuration, and subscription work to start the day-forward flow of documents. Those desiring to have Jethro's help need to let him know (jsheridan@courts.az.gov) so he can plan accordingly.

Members asked questions about the implications for non-OnBase systems used in the state and whether "get doc" requests made to systems not transferring documents would have to be

fulfilled in PDF format. Stewart likened the requirement to that of courtroom recordings being exchanged in .WAV format – they don't have to be saved in the format but do have to be converted upon request.

REVIEW	TECHNCAL STANDARDS RELATED TO RULE 124	Stewart Bruner

Staff member Stewart Bruner reviewed the development history of Rule 124 and its related technical standards. He then summarized proposed changes to the three technical standards, ACJA §§ 1-507, 1-504, and 1-506. He emphasized members' need to scrutinize the changes before they get posted for broader comment, since no committee has orchestrated the revision effort – Stewart has used his judgment on technical updates and simply codified changes requested by AZTurboCourt in support of the statewide e-filing paradigm. He reviewed some specific changes members need to be aware of:

- 1-507 has a new section for administrative rather than case documents, a replacement certification for MCDB, and an exemption for documents stored in an AOC-controlled EDMS.
- 1-504 has removed provisions superseded by selection of a standard product for EDMS in the courts; added a new section governing disconnected scanning activities; clarified metadata, integration, and quality assurance requirements; added a requirement for ability to output PDF; forced public access to documents through the AZTurboCourt portal at a minimum; and added a range of allowed scanning densities above 200 dpi.
- 1-506 has removed provisions superseded by selection of a standard product for EDMS in the courts; specifies XML formats; allows hyperlinks for citations and requires bookmarks for filings containing multiple appendices; allows abstracts for form-based filings being reproduced; focuses processes on AZTurboCourt as the front end; adds requirement that every CMS and EDMS participate in e-filing integration; and allows sealed or confidential filings with appropriate metadata to indicate such.

Stewart will collect comments and concerns from members via e-mail until September 9. Concerns about court administrative records requirements may be shared with Jennifer Greene at jgreene@courts.az.gov.

DISCUSS	FY12 ARCHITECTURE TARGETS UPDATE EFFORT	Steven Scales

Steven Scales, Architecture Manager at the AOC, previewed potential changes to the Enterprise Architecture Standards table using a strawman markup. Members discussed the implications of making various changes that Steve suggested. Karl clarified the meaning of the retirement column and stated that the appearance of a product in the target column does not necessarily mean that all AOC applications will interface with it seamlessly at this point. A suggestion was made to link dependencies to targets on the table somehow in the interest of informing COT and business leaders of the larger reason for the target. More discussion will take place in subsequent TAC meetings. In the meantime, Steve requested members having comments or further changes address those to him at sscales@courts.az.gov.

TAC MEETING MINUTES

UPDATE	FY12 PRIORITY PROJECTS AT MARICOPA SUPERIOR COURT	John Barrett

John Barrett, Chief Technology Officer for Maricopa Superior Court, briefly highlighted the top project priorities for the fiscal year, including:

- iCIS case management system rewrite for .NET environment,
- Clerk's Financial System replacement (development),
- Jury system rewrite (by the vendor),
- Infrastructure refresh and capacity increases for iCIS,
- Criminal Tower technology support,
- Juvenile Probation integration activities,
- e-Filing development/support for Justice Courts and Clerk of Court,
- Virtualizing desktops/implementing tablets and related policy issues,
- Rewrite/refresh of Internet and Intranet pages.

The chair requested to hold a TAC meeting at the new criminal tower in order to inspect the courtroom technology designed into the building, possibly in February of 2012. Staff will coordinate with Maricopa representatives.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Karl Heckart

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, Karl adjourned the meeting at 12:40 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:	August 5, 2011	AOC – Conference Room 230
	October 7, 2011	AOC – Conference Room 230

MEETING ADJOURNED	12:40 PM